REMARKS

In response to the Examiner's restriction requirement, applicants elect, with traverse, species I, namely, claims 6-13, wherein pertaining to a device having a plurality of emitter sites formed by laser crystallisation. It is respectfully submitted that the restriction requirement is in error for at least two reasons.

Method claims 1-5 are directed to the same invention as device claims 6-13. A full search of the prior art as to the claimed device would of necessity include a review of the methods for making such device. Furthermore, claim 6 recites that the structure is made by a process that involves use of a laser, as claimed in claim 1. For these reasons, claims 1-5 should also be examined along with claims 6-13 at this time.

As to the remaining claims, applicants expressly reserve the right to file one or more divisional applications for the subject matter of those claims.

Finally, an information disclosure statement is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/28/05 Julie 8 (Rey No. 57, 093)

fig: Allan A. Fanucci (Reg. No. 30,256)

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP CUSTOMER NO. 28765 (212) 294-3311